

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 17 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 17 stand rejected as anticipated.

Claims 1, 7, 8, and 14 are amended to further recite features that were implicit in the original claims when those claims were interpreted in view of the specification and the level of skill in the art, as required by the MPEP. The amendments are being made to avoid discussion on whether Applicants are requesting the Examiner to read limitations into the claims and thereby expedite the prosecution.

Claims 1 to 17 remain rejected as being anticipated by Turbo C++ Version 4.5, Borland International, 1995 hereinafter referred to as Borland. In sustaining the rejection, the Examiner stated in part

. . . Since said extensions are user definable . . . , it is well within reason that user selection of a file extension can be interpreted as a "directly assigned attribute", . . . Opening a .cpp file containing an established object "int" will be detected as special via having a directly assigned association of type .cpp, hence the user applied bolding style will be automatically applied accordingly (the "Default" setting of Borland also automatically applies a bolding style to the int object).

However, opening a file without any extension within the Borland editor containing the same "int" object will not be detected as special by the system since the file (with object int) has not been assigned an extension (attribute), therefore bolding will not be applied (the same int object in the latter case is not assigned any attributes) . . .

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 1. Applicants first note that the rejection is not based upon any teaching in Borland, but rather a hypothetical situation posited in the rejection. Further, it has not been demonstrated by citation to the reference that the Borland editor can open a file without any extension, and in

fact what Borland would do in such a situation. Typically, files without an extension can be opened only by assuming some default extension and opening the file in accordance with the assumed default extension. Accordingly, without citing a teaching of how such the Borland editor processes a file without an extension, it cannot be shown that the reference teaches the invention to the same level of detail as recited in Claim 1.

Further, even if such a showing could be made, the fact that it was necessary to use two different files demonstrates that the method is not being performed on a single computer-readable document as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection itself demonstrates that the rejection is not well founded.

Further, a file extension is not an attribute that is assigned individually to an object by a user when the file is open. The file extension is an attribute of the file and not any particular object. The file extension is assigned to all elements in the file as a group and not individually assigned to objects as recited in Claim 1. Finally, even if the file extension were a directly assigned attribute, the file extension is not replaced as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection failed to establish that the reference teaches the invention to the same level of detail as recited in Claim 1 at multiple levels. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2 to 6 depend from Claim 1 and so distinguish over Borland for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 2 to 6.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claim 7, the above comments with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Moreover, changing or not changing a file

extension fails to teach anything concerning converting "directly assigned attributes." Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7.

Claim 8 stands rejected on the same basis as Claim 1. The above comments concerning Claim 1 and Borland are applicable to Claim 8 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 8.

Claims 9 to 13 depend from Claim 8 and so distinguish over Borland for at least the same reasons as Claim 8. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 9 to 13.


Claim 14 stands rejected on the same basis as Claim 1. The above comments concerning Claim 1 and Borland are applicable to Claim 14 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 14.

Claims 15 to 17 depend from Claim 14 and so distinguish over Borland for at least the same reasons as Claim 14. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 15 to 17.

Claims 1 to 17 remain in the application. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 14 have been amended. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).


CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on February 24, 2006.


Attorney for Applicant(s)

February 24, 2006
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,


Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880